

## Executive Summary Supplemental 2

*The following is a list of textual comments by Sate for Question 14 of the NAIP 2005 Survey. Question 14 reads, “**Please include additional information, suggestions, or comments about NAIP**”. The comments are in an “as is” format, and have not been altered or modified to correct grammar or spelling; the only modifications were in the removal of proper names from comments. If there were not comments from a particular State, the State was not listed.*

### CA –

Presently, 2005 imagery has not been received for our County.

Imagery needs to be provided to the county offices much earlier in the year. If a field visit will be required to verify or clarify information present on the imagery we need to have enough notice to schedule the site visit while the crop is still in the field. Receiving the imagery several months after the crop has been harvested and or disposed of is of little use if there is no evidence present in the field.

Clear imagery made the crops easy to identify.

Imagery was received later than promised for our County

The 05 NAP imagery is too large for our hardware. Our computers regularly freeze up when loading the imagery, requiring us to reload the imagery several times a day when we are using it. We need upgraded computers to handle this type of technology! Also, some areas are so dark it is not useful at all, seems to vary quite a bit within one county

Receipt of the imagery in mid summer would help us complete crop compliance activities in a more timely manner.

Overall the imagery is very good. Our takes care of 3 counties, and we need to have the imagery in July or August. November is late, because our farmers are starting to plant again and if we need to make a physical spot check to compare with the imagery, it is to late. The survey form is not user friendly and could use some improvement. I was not able to select state & county. I could only select the state. Also, the form did not fill the landscape criteria without making some adjustments in print preview. My suggestion is, do not use the drop down window for the answers to your questions.

Imagery received in January. Crop compliance work should have been done last fall. Fields are covered with snow now so ground checking is not possible. Fortunately we anticipated this problem because we had it last year also. We did full crop compliance

ground checks soon after the final crop reporting date of July 15. The imagery will be a good historical record for the 2005 crops.

The NAIP imagery was flown too early for our County (mid June) to be able to view most of the crops. A flight in mid July would have been better.

It would also be very helpful if the process for spot checking could be simplified as to the access of the screens and the process in general. It seems like even to print a map the steps to do so are numerous. If these process could be streamlined I think the tool would be far more accessible for the common person who is not a computer wiz.

## **CT –**

Incorrect zone of imagery was received therefore the CLU layer did not overlap on to the NAIP imagery making it difficult to do compliance.

## **FL –**

Depending on where you are, Florida has many growing seasons. One thing for certain is that attempts to fly the state between June and September are not advisable due to atmospheric conditions. October - November and April - May will probably yield the best results. I am glad to see that our spring compliance flight are scheduled May - June, hopefully the weather will cooperate and we will get good data. We are very pleased with the quality of data that was delivered to us in December, it has proved to be very useful so far.

In our Counties, the NAIP imagery has proven to be very useful. Our State GIS Co-Ordinator has begun the work of training County Offices within the State to use the GIS system. Our State has lagged behind others in the use of this new system but with our new Co-Ordinator, we are expecting great results in the future. Keep up the good work !

We are not a certified county yet so we have not had the pleasure of using our imagery for the processes that you have requested information, comments and suggestions on but in viewing what we have been instructed on and what I have seen in other areas I feel that once we are certified and able to use the imagery it will be most beneficial to the procedures we have to perform within the county office. Sorry we could not provide you with more information regarding the use of the imagery but we are looking forward to the ability to put it to use once we have our county certified.

I think it would be feasible for a flight in May or July. Then, a flight in October.

## **IA –**

I'll depend on the county response to answer the quality and usefulness of the 2005 imagery. I know of one county that has gray color imagery and does not allow

identification of different crop types in the same field. Am working that issue with APFO. I have heard about other counties with the same problem but am unable to identify by name. The few samples I viewed at the STO were good imagery.

We had a few scattered clouds that blocked imagery in some parts of the county.

I am able to tell the difference between crops but I am not able to identify the crops without a certification map from the producer.

CAN ALSO BE USED TO SEE IF THE BINS ARE ON THE FARM SITE AS PRODUCER SAYS.

Very nice and clear photography, thank you!

provide additional explanation to public when acres do not match registered land surveyor state licensed document.

If our county had been flown earlier, it would have been much easier to determine oats from alfalfa or mixed hay. By the time our county was flown, oats had been harvested and it is hard to determine the difference between oats and hay. The imagery from last year was much better. It is very difficult to tell the difference this year between corn and beans. The colors are primarily in the gray tones with just a little difference in a touch of green.

imagery was not anywhere near as good as 2004. It is very difficult to tell the difference between crops for 2005.

Our imagery was taken August 6th. We would be better served if the date was 2 or 3 weeks earlier. The color quality was a disappointment as it is hard to distinguish between crops. It is difficult to use the imagery for CLU maintenance and/or measurement when the imagery does not line up with our CLU exactly as our ortho imagery does.

2005 NAIP Imagery is very useful in our GIS work and other office situations. It seems like the 2005 NAIP is better quality than the 2004 imagery.

Our NAIP Imagery was very dark. It is very hard to distinguish corn vs soybean acres. Ravens, ditches and waterways are hard to distinguish.

The colors were not distinct enough this year to be able to tell the difference between crops in the same field. The colors were better last year. This year the overlays matched better than they did last year.

Our office uses the NAIP imagery to check for existing grass when a CRP waterway application is taken.

There was a HUGE improvement in our County's 2005 imagery. The overlay of the NAIP & Ortho was much, much better than 2004's.

Improve clarity of Image for 2005 year.

NRCS uses for conservation plan compliance eg. waterways and strips as well as CRP practices which were installed.

It is very hard to tell the difference between crops and grass. The colors need to be different for clearer distinction.

IT WOULD BE NICE TO GET THE IMAGERY EARLIER SO THAT WE CAN WORK ON OTHER MEASUREMENTS BEFORE IT IS TIME TO DO YEARLY SPOT CHECKS. 2004 AND 2005 IMAGERY GETS BLURRY WHEN WE ZOOM IN WHERE THE 2001 IMAGERY DOES NOT. IS THERE A WAY TO MAKE IMAGERY BETTER FOR WHEN WE NEED TO ZOOM IN ON SOMETHING AND SEE THEM CLEARLY.

I haven't been able to work very much on the new imagery, but what I have seen I think I will like it.

Our 2003 imagery was not usable due to poor quality. Our 2004 imagery was excellent. Our 2005 imagery is not as good of quality as the 2004, but much better than 2003. It lacks color quality making it difficult to determine crop types.

I thought the 2005 NAIP imagery was much better than the 2004.

We have a problem with parts of our county being in two different Zones. This creates problems with how our county is flown and the files that the NAIP is saved under.

The 2005 NAIP photos are not as clear as I would like to see. Details are not very clear when zoomed in close.

IT MAKES CERTIFICATION MUCH EASIER.

It is hard to distinguish between some crops and CRP.

**IL –**

Questions 5 and 7 -- At some point later we may be able to use this imagery in coordination with other local agencies. At this point we do not use it this way.

Timing of the photography appears to be good for compliance work, but delivery to county offices needs to be made sooner. It would be better if it was in our hands early September if possible.

NAIP imagery needs to be received in the county office by mid August to the beginning of September to complete compliance work by the beginning of crop harvest and so it can be completed in the same fiscal year for workload reporting.

It is helpful to have the NAIP imagery in the County office in late August or early September so we may start compliance activities earlier

Color definition between crops (corn, soybeans, grasses) is very hard to distinguish. Also, shadows from trees adjacent to fields make it impossible to determine definite field boundaries.

Our NAIP was received timely however, the image is very dark and does not seem to be as clear as those received in the past.

Could be a little clearer. Like the green better than the red

Perhaps it would be better to fly Illinois in a South to North pattern instead of East to West. That way, you would track the maturity of the crop that is planted earlier in the South than the North. Historically, the optimum time to fly Western Illinois is the first 2 weeks in July. That captures to greatest color distinction in the growing crops, and even allows us to distinguish between CRP and pasture/hay acres.

I would prefer to have the NAIP imagery flown in late June to early July and delivered no later than August 15th. Also the 2005 NAIP imagery is too dark, there is not enough contrast between corn and soybean crops. My opinion is that the 2004 near infrared NAIP imagery was a better product.

Imagery almost too dark. We adjusted the monitor settings to see more clearly.

NAIP is a new enough process in the County that we are enjoying using it and learning what its capabilities are.

Better resolution. Color does not appear to be accurate. In past years there is an obvious difference in color between the two crops. This year there is not. The greens appear to be about the same shade.

WE LIKED THE OPTION OF CHANGING THE COLOR OF THE 2004 NAIP IMAGERY FROM RED TO GREEN. THE 2005 HAS A BLACK/WHITE COLOR AND CAN BE DIFFICULT IN DETERMINING CROP TYPE.

The 2005 NAIP imagery was clearer and sharper than the 2004 NAIP. However, since the 2004 was infrared, I found it easier to differentiate between crops than it was with the 2005 imagery, which was black/white.

Overall, the quality of the 2005 NAIP was very good. The main improvement we would like to see is in the timing of the delivery. If the imagery could be flown by mid-July and

in the County Office by mid-August it would be more helpful for compliance work and for cropland changes/updates to the CLU layer. This is because in most years much we will have time to do alot of this work from mid-August through September. When the NAIP imagery is not received until October, most employees are busy with price support activities and unable to work with it until late fall.

True colors are much more usefull than infrared. The higher the resolution the better. Need to have exact allignment on various image layers (VERY IMPORTANT).

The color was too dark, not enough variation in shading between crops. Flight lines not merged together well.

Alternating color of the imagery helps with the comparison of changes between years.

We needed this kind of imagery for CLU activities to start with, The red imagery was blurry and not linedc up. I am finding a lot of cropland that we took out of production because we thought it was shrub ground and wasn't.

I liked the red NAIP better. This new color is difficult to see sometimes

question 10 - This was not helpful for 05, but hopefully will be for 06.

3 given in item 6 due to lower resolution compared to base map. Newer image as compared to base map does help to determine proper boundaries, but exact measures are more difficult.

If the imagery was received Mid-Summer it would have been more beneficial. The infrared imagery shows more clarity.

We like the color of the 2005 NAIP Imagery over the 2004 infrared NAIP Imagery.

I wish we could receive them a little earlier than when we have received the the last two years. They help us out a lot.

Improvement over black and white imagery.

A higher resolution NAIP imagery would be a great help with some tasks.

2004 NAIP was infra red and was much better and easier to use for our applications 2005 is not very clear and shades are to close to be very useful for fine adjustments.

**IN –**

I have only one problem with the NAIP imagery, especially this year's imagery, and that is the quality. The 2003 imagery was and still is the best imagery that we have received. I know the 2003 imagery is at one meter resolution and the 2004 & 2005 are at two meter

resolution; which clearly makes the 03 imagery that much better. I'm more worried about the drastic change in the quality of the imagery. The 2004 imagery was riddled with problems, and this 2005 imagery is almost unusable. Some of our farmers think that this years imagery was flown sometime in early June, we don't know that for sure, but either way it was still flown way too early to actual tell the difference between the crops planted.

There is and always will be a great problem of using NAIP imagery to its fullest extent when you have been operating with a county office that has averaged 1.8 employees understaffed the last several years.

It was unclear when the imagery was taken (month/date of flight lines)

THE COLOR CLARITY IS NOT SHARP ENOUGH TO DISTINGUISH DIFFERENT CROPS. (ie SOYBEANS ARE USUALLY A MUCH DARKER GREEN THAN CORN)

We have varying colors in certain fields of the same crop. We assumed that this was caused by the tiling of the imagery into our county map imagery.

A Clearer resolution could be used, that way when you try to get close things don't look grainy.

The timing of the flights seems to be one of the most important issues with usefulness of the imagery for Compliance purposes. The ability to distinguish between crops can be difficult if flown too early. In the case of Indiana, the suggestion is to give consideration to an East-West flight pattern across the state as opposed to the traditional North-South pattern. The major benefit being the earlier planting dates to the South would give allowances for the crop maturity in the northern counties. Discussions between Illinois, Ohio and Indiana GIS Coordinators/Specialists and Program Specialists within each of the 3-states feel merit exists in trying the flight pattern.

**LA –**

I would like for the NAIP imagery to be infra red for compliance spot checks. This would make it is to compare the imagery to the certification.

Recently acquired NAIP; usage has not been extensive, but I do enjoy comparing the current NAIP imagery land status to the less current GIS map to arrive at a more accurate land description for the producer.

2004 IMAGERY WAS GOOD.THIS 2005 IMAGERY WAS TOO DARK AND IT WAS FLOWN TOO LATE. THESE FLIGHTS SHOULD BE FLOWN NO LATER THEN AUGUST, AND REICIVED SOME TIME IN SEPTEMBER . THIS WOULD BE IDEAL FOR SPOTCHECKING COMPLIANCE.

NAIP imagery needs to be flown timely, the quality of the imagery needs to be clear and crisp with prompt delivery of the product.

## **MN –**

Comparing our imagery to other counties our color is not showing up to identify different crops. The photos would be good for maintenance, but for compliance it is hard to see different crops.

Infrared imagery would be helpful for compliance purposes. The current imagery is often very grainy and color differences at times hard to see thus making it difficult to determine if a field is corn or soybeans for example.

It would be great if we could receive the imagery by the end of September so we could complete compliance before the crops are under snow or fall plowed, in the event we need on-site verifications. Also the correct acreage would be used to determine yields for LDP maximums that are set.

I am the compliance PT in our county and, therefore, am currently interested in using the imagery for crop compliance spot checks. Since the imagery was received so late in the year, and due to the heavy LDP workload in our office at the present time, I have only been able to use the imagery to do compliance spot checks on five farms. The imagery seems very adequate for this purpose; crop colors are not as distinct as previous imagery, but crop boundaries thus far are very clear. I would greatly appreciate receiving the imagery in August - September when the workload in other programs in the county office is not so demanding.

If imagery is distributed to CO's earlier it would help with RMA and crop insurance inspections and complete FSA compliance timely and help reduce field work (example: in the past FSA used to use the compliance imagery for late filed certifications vs. GPS measurements in the field)

The imagery is of excellent quality. The only concern is getting the imagery ASAP even in August would be much more helpful

The imagery needs to be delivered to our county before snowfall for compliance reasons. When I view a field that does not look like the crop that was reported, it was too late to send a reporter out to verify the crop because of snowfall.

If flight was flown in July for the more northern Mn counties. Many times our crops are not seeded until close to the June final plant date. July pictures would better reflect the an identifiable crop.

Color bad.

Still would like to see us move to infrared imagery. The 2005 imagery is very hard to work with this year when trying to differentiate between corn and soybeans. Being a highly developing county it would be nice to have 1 meter resolution for the compliance imagery also in order to do more maintenance.

I don't know when the our county was flown, but I'm finding that some of the subfields are difficult to discern (e.g. 1A if corn and 1B is soybeans). Would these divisions be easier to detect if the imagery was done at a different time?

Cannot determine row crops. Looks like flown to early, cannot determine acres very easily.

It would be nice to know the date the imagery was flown. It would be beneficial to get the imagery earlier.

Would be very helpful to get imagery in early September

Cannot tell crop by color. Fly later and deliver sooner

Imagery is very good, but needs to be received more timely.

We need to get our imagery by the end of August, so we can get compliance done before we get busy with Price Support.

Receiving the imagery in the early fall prior to harvest so that compliance could be completed in September. In years past the COF received aerial slides in August, September. Spot checks much easier to complete without snow on the ground and before thistles on CRP are gone to seed.

It appears that the imagery was taken too early, because some of the corn fields that we know ran 140 bu/ac show up black or as "no apparent cover" on the 2005 imagery. Then we received the imagery very late, like November, which is pretty late to be doing compliance activities because everything is already worked back and there is usually snow on the ground. One thing that the imagery could be helpful with is CLU boundary identification, since it was taken when there was little plant growth shown.

We could use the imagery earlier so compliance can be finished before LDP season starts.

The imagery was very good this year!!!

For compliance work and fruit and vegetable issues, we need the image in September.

Try to get the imagery out faster so we aren't as busy with DCP signups.

Get it to us sooner, before the crops are gone (September-October).

It would be nice to see the specific dates flown somewhere in the metadata. Our County was flown earlier this year than in previous years and sometimes it was difficult to distinguish the crop lines. Knowing the flight dates would aid in the decision to physically visit the fields.

It would be very useful to have a yearly product that would allow us to make changes to the CLU based on the compliance imagery. As it is now, we aren't allowed to make changes based on compliance imagery due to accuracy. However, when a producer breaks new land, or there is road construction, etc, we need to be able to make corrections immediately, not in 5 years when we receive the next ortho-imagery. GPSing all of these changes every year is not practical, even if we could convince producers to pay for it - there simply isn't the time/money.

It would be nice if the NAIP could come in August as most offices are not as busy then and could complete compliance.

Comparing our imagery to other counties our color is not showing up to identify different crops. The photos would be good for maintenance, but for compliance it is hard to see different crops.

we always used to get our imagery before harvest (July/August), now we do not receive it until we have snow on the ground

Delivery could have been sooner

The imagery was taken at a time when acreages were fully saturated. Field lines were very difficult to identify due to drown out and late planting. My survey responses are reflective of the fact that the annual imagery is to be used only for compliance purposes. Over the years we have found definite program advantages to having annual photography being completed and support continuation. We understand the difficulty in scheduling the completion of the flights due to workload and weather conditions.

This is a good product it just needs to be here sooner August would be good or earlier in September.

The imagery was a good match in for some fields, and off on others making it unreliable for measurements, corrections, changes, etc. It is useful enough as a guide for compliance. As far as our county, the timing of the imagery and its reception here in the office was more than adequate.

THE 2005 IMAGERY SEEMED VERY CLEAR, WHICH WAS VERY HELPFUL WITH ALL THE PREVENTED PLANTING

Would like it ortho-rectified and more timely (August-September).

Hard to tell crops, color not the best.

Infrared imagery would be helpful for compliance purposes. The current imagery is often very grainy and color differences at times hard to see thus making it difficult to determine if a field is corn or soybeans for example.

The only suggestion that I have is to get the imagery to the counties sooner, possibly by August 15th . That way if there is a problem, the slides can be reflowed before harvest is completed or residue is tilled in the case of small grains.

If imagery is distributed to CO's earlier it would help with RMA and crop insurance inspections and complete FSA compliance timely and help reduce field work (example: in the past FSA used to use the compliance imagery for late filed certifications vs. GPS measurements in the field)

receiving the imagery earlier in the fall would be more useful. At this late date, discrepancies in compliance issues will be hard to dispute if actual field verification is required due to the snow cover.

Receive imagery in a more timely fashion

Better than ever seen it.

I am the compliance PT in our county and, therefore, am currently interested in using the imagery for crop compliance spot checks. Since the imagery was received so late in the year, and due to the heavy LDP workload in our office at the present time, I have only been able to use the imagery to do compliance spot checks on five farms. The imagery seems very adequate for this purpose; crop colors are not as distinct as previous imagery, but crop boundaries thus far are very clear. I would greatly appreciate receiving the imagery in August - September when the workload in other programs in the county office is not so demanding.

Some of the above answers are influenced by our inability to use anything other than our ortho imagery in CLU maintenance. The 2005 image is a good reference tool for activities, but is limited by our policy/procedure. Of course, 1 meter imagery would be nicer than the 2 meter, but that is more of a budget/time issue than quality or service item. This electronic product is so much nicer than the old manual records, that we can't complain too much. Thanks!

We need the imagery earlier so we can do field checks.

States should develop a map index layer for each Service Center that then prioritizes those indexes that need to be included so that in lean budget years fringe areas of less importance could be skipped. Developing and maintaining this layer provides states with an opportunity to also check the coverage of the areas they are serving.

We could use the imagery earlier so compliance can be finished before LDP season starts.

Receiving the imagery in the early fall prior to harvest so that compliance could be completed in September. In years past the COF received aerial slides in August, September. Spot checks much easier to complete without snow on the ground and before thistles on CRP are gone to seed.

## **MO –**

EXCELLENT UPGRADE FOR MAPPING. FOR COMPLIANCE, TWO FLIGHTS WOULD BE IDEAL, BUT MIGHT BE COST PROHIBITIVE.

Improved resolution would be very beneficial. We don't need to be able to read license plates, but sharp enough to better identify farmstead buildings.

The infrared imagery is so much clearer than the green.

THE IMAGERY NEEDS TO BE CLEARER FOR GIS WORK. WHEN ZOOMED IN, IT BECOMES VERY BLURRY.

Needs to be flown about 3 weeks later.

The slides taken for 2005 in our county were taken too early and did not show clearly how the crops developed. They were taken in June and most of the wheat had not been harvested and late planted soybeans did not show up clearly. Slides need to be taken the first or second week in July to catch soybeans.

This year's imagery was a bit fuzzier and/or grayer than 2004. It is more difficult to distinguish boundaries and crops - especially between soybeans and hay/pasture when there is no permanent boundary to go by. Even the color difference between corn and soybeans is much less clear than last year.

## **MS –**

2005 NAIP WAS BLURRED AND HARD TO READ

Imagery very grainy. Had to have State specialist adjust imagery so it could be useful.

CLEARER IMAGE EARLIER DELIVERY

For compliance purposes it would have been better to have received our NAIP imagery last October. That is the only complaint, otherwise NAIP is very useful.

Our 2004 NAIP imagery was great (1 meter resolution). I know the 2005 was not at 1 meter resolution, but that was not the only difference. The entire county image was extremely dark for 2005.

At this point, we are in the first phase of working with CLU and have not used NAIP imagery with our CLU work. However, we believe that the NAIP imagery will be useful with CLU certification and maintenance, in addition to measurement services. Thanks!

Our 2005 imagery was still a little dark even after it was lightened. As far as the survey itself goes, I know this will sound petty, but the page didn't fit the screen from right to left and it was a little annoying having to scroll back & forth to read the questions and fill in the answer block.

**NC –**

Cloud cover on some flightlines cause difficulty in completing compliance activities; image resolution needs improvement

The only complication I would address is that, according to the flight table associated with NAIP, portions of our county were flown on three separate dates. Since this occurred, verification of one particular crop may not be available for the entire county. The only suggestion that I would address is the possibility of two flights per county throughout the year, since crops grown and harvested in our county spans from November to October.

NAIP imagery was clear and matched CLU boundaries

dates of the imagery should be closer together, ex. All in same week/month

It would be very helpful if early and late flights of NAIP Imagery were available so we could survey our various crops during their individual harvest seasons.

Imagery would have best served the County Office if it had been flown during the month of July, probably the latter part of July or very early August to capture the DC Soybeans. Also, if imagery is received in the County Office during the month of August it would give the County Office time to complete much of the compliance work before the new FY.

NAIP is needed by August 1

NAIP Imagery would be more useful in 1 meter so we could accurately update our imagery. We are still using 1993 aerial photos.

Onslow has not completed our compliance activities at this time. We are waiting for software upgrades.

Flight Time for our county should be August 1, 2005 through August 15.

If NAIP imagery could be received earlier in the year it would be more beneficial.

In prior years, when the old AO process was used we were consulted by the AO key county offices as to when we would like our slides to be taken (when we wanted to be flown). This can vary from year to year depending on growing conditions. So, this type of customization by county is something we missed this year. Generally, the 2005 flight was too early for Western North Carolina.

Ideal for measuring crops and photograph changes

If NAIP imagery could be received earlier in the year it would be more beneficial.

The possibility of being able to replace each years certified SID with the new NAIP Imagery and also a higher resolution

In prior years, when the old AO process was used we were consulted by the AO key county offices as to when we would like our slides to be taken (when we wanted to be flown). This can vary from year to year depending on growing conditions. So, this type of customization by county is something we missed this year. Generally, the 2005 flight was too early for Western North Carolina.

New users of NAIP Imagery would benefit from some type of Users Guide to Crop Identification or Training in Crop Recognition.

We did not NAIP until late October. We need to receive it earlier to be for our RMA Spot Checks and other compliance work.

IT IS MUCH EASIER TO LOCATE TRACTS TO CHECK AND THE IMAGES SEEM TO BE CLEARER.

NAIP can become very useful to FSA. However, this year it was not received in the county office in time for measurement service or timely completion of compliance. Since it was not received in time for measurement service, I had to measure everything on the ground. Also it was flown a little early to pick up soybeans. I understand North Carolina was flown mid June. My county needs to be flown during the month of July to pick up wheat, corn and double cropped soybeans. We used to be more concerned with flue cured tobacco, but that crop is not really an issue anymore.

**ND –**

The NAIP imagery is not received timely in the County Office. We are unable to complete a producer's measurement service request until January which is approximately 4 months too late. Spotchecks are unable to be performed until late winter which

prevents any potential field visits for clarification and/or verification. The NAIP Imagery is usually of good quality. Comments are based on the late delivery of imagery.

2005 imagery was NOT received timely enough for the measurement services. We had producers who canceled their measurement service requests due to lateness. Also, due to lateness of receiving imagery - spotchecks were put on hold and could not be completed timely.

Take later in the Summer when there is more contrast between crops. I.e; mid-July. The 2005 imagery has little contrast and is very dark. This is hard to work with. The lateness of its arrival loses its value as a compliance tool as well as for measurement service provided to farmers.

The imagery looked good. The insurance companies and some of the producers that had requested measurement service thought the delivery of the imagery was a little late.

NAIP Imagery needs to be received in the field office by August/September.

2004 imagery was very poor when the zoom in close feature was used. The 2005 imagery was much better but was not timely received.

I appreciate being able to download through the datagateway web site. Color is dark and lightening through the properties helps but also affects the clarity. Delivery for measurement service requests and compliance issues is too late in the crop year.

Need to have imagery by end of August.

NAIP imagery needs to be flown after July 15th in this area in order to get good crop canopy and be available for county use by September 1st. There needs to be faster delivery time to the County office after flown in order to use for spot check purposes and measurement service for that crop year. However, the key thing is to have good crop canopy and clear imagery to use regardless of the time frame. This is a fine line due to weather conditions. If this is not capable, we need to think about Satellite imagery so that you can get it and use it on demand for good time lines and crop canopy!! I believe crop insurance could use this as well!!

It would be more useful if received earlier in the year. October of the applicable crop year.

Even though the imagery receipt date has been delayed, current workload activities in the county office have limited the amount of time we have had to utilize the 05 imagery. It appears to have excellent clarity and appears much better than the 2004 imagery.

Delivery of the NAIP in a "timely manner" , in other words in the "current" year would be helpful so that compliance activities can be completed so that necessary

reconstitutions for the upcoming year can be completed timely as well, resulting in less work with compliance because of new farm numbers, tract divisions etc..etc..

Naip imagery should be received in the County Office by October of current year for compliance activities. Our office received the 2005 imagery in January of 2006.

For compliance purposes, imagery need to be received by the beginning of September.

The imagery needs to be provided to the county office more timely to be used for compliance purposes. Completing compliance in February of the following year served no use - If we would need to follow up with ground inspection - it is too late.

The coloring was very dark. Hard to see the difference between the green crop and the black drownout areas in the fields

We would prefer to receive imagery in September to help with crop indentifications, CRP compliance issues, and to aid in indentifying new breakings.

The overall quality of the imagery was very clear/good. Ideally the photography should be received no later than September 1st to complete compliance activities prior to the end of the program/fiscal year. Although it may be difficult to do for all counties, it is optimal if the photography is taken when the small grains are starting to mature and turn color. This allows for more efficient identifcaiton of small grain crops in comparison to row crops. Also, it would be beneficial to know the specific dates the photography was taken for future reference and compliance purposes.

To fly too early or too late renders the imagery useless - why go through the expense if you can't use it and have to go out on the ground anyway. We were pleased with the overall results this year (2005), but some of the imagery was flown early and is difficult to differentiate between some of the crops. Overall, the imagery is good and useful.

Overall we are pleased with the imagery. The imagery in our area however was dark and was delivered too late to be of much use for compliance or measurement services.

The acreage could have been flown later in the growing season but still allowing enough time for delivery to be used for its itended purpose. The imagery was flown too early in our growing season in ND to determine the different crops by visual inspection

Imagery is great, however, we received in January of 06 - need to have in the fall of the year for effective compliance purposes.

We feel that the imagery has to be received in a timely manner to be used for the current years compliance activities. The fact that we received our imagery in later January is totally unacceptable. We would normally have our information in August and have our compliance spotchecks done in September. We also have several producers that annually apply for a measurement service request and we were not able to provide a timely service

for these producers. They had to wait until the later part of January for their request to be completed. I see a great need to have the info out to the field offices timely.

Need it sooner

## **NE –**

The imagery is very helpful in the administration of our programs. It is a tremendous improvement from the old slides taken in years past. The only problem that we have noticed is during compliance spot checking, by the time we receive the imagery at the end of September, ground work has already begun for fall planting of the next years wheat crop. So if we are needing to do a field visit to check a field boundry or to verify crop residue of the current year crop it has been destroyed by the tillage. We realize that if imagery is taking in mid-July that it does take time to process that imagery for the counties, but for compliance purposes it would be nice to be able to complete spotchecking in August for the current year instead of Oct. and Nov.

When we started our 2005 compliance activities this year we were told by our State Office to allow 5 days for imagery to get to us - because of the heavy workload on you. I requested imagery for 7 counties and I received it the same day! This helped to make things go smooth with the 2005 compliance activities. Thank you.

## **OH –**

The wheat crop in our area was very dark hard to distinguish boundary lines against grass, or wooded areas.

Could be very useful assisting with the new National Animal ID program.

The imagery was a little dark in my opinion. That can make some determinations difficult. While the dates flown were very good in this county, it would have been very helpful to have the imagery in early August so that changes that effect the current crop year can be made in the office prior to program dealines the end of September.

The images are very fuzzy and color differences are very hard to distinguish

Imagery is very dark, making distinction between similar crops difficult. Resolution that is equal to 2004 NAIP Imagery would be much more desirable.

The colors do nto look consisent thorough the county. I have not yet started 2005 compoliance, but in some area I will be able to tell a crop change but not confrim the crop as either corn or soybeans. I will rely on the FSA-578 crop certification form.

2005 NAIP Imagery cannot be used for maintenance purposes because it is 2m resolution. The imagery is useful however, for detecting and validating changes in CLU

maintenance, as well as doing compliance. Overall, the NAIP Imagery was received timely, and appears to be useful in most aspects of our CLU programs.

The Imagery would be more useful if flown in July and to scale

This is a very important tool to our office in many ways and it would be more helpful if it was clearer. In some places it is very "fuzzy".

Excellent tool but the imagery wasn't as clear as hoped, but overall makes our job more accurate and easier.

Wish we had the new imagery before we printed our maps! It appears to be great!

there were no good answers available for questions 1-10 in this county. The 2005 NAIP has not been used yet for compliance. It is useless for measuring because it was purchased at the 2 meter level.

**OUR NAIP IMAGERY WAS VERY DARK, AND NOT VERY CLEAR**

It would be nice if the imagery was flown a little later. The difference in corn and soybeans is hard to tell from the imagery.

The imagery is very useful, especially when dealing with contour strips.

It would be nice if it was in scale so we could use it for CLU maintenance as we have lots of clu's that need corrections each year.

There is too much cloud cover to make the imagery a reliable source of information. Also, the crispness of the 2004 NAIP versus the 2005 NAIP makes the 2004 NAIP more reliable for changes and measurement services.

the imagery is very dark and hard to distinguish the lines.

**NEED 1 METER IMAGERY IS NEEDED TO BE OFFICIAL WE HAD TO GO BACK TO 04 SOME FLIGHT PATTERNS WERE CLEAR AND BRIGHT WHILE OTHERS WERE DARK AND ABOUT THE SAME COLORATION HARD TO TELL DIFFERENCES IN CROPS**

The imagery is too dark to really be useful.

We were told that we could not use the imagery for CLU maintenance or many other activities because it was not as accurate as the base imagery. To really be helpful so that it may be used more effectively, the 2004 NAIP scale is needed.

The sooner we can receive the new imagery, the sooner we can update changes.

The quality of the 2005 NAIP was too dark to determine boundaries of fields and property lines.

Agency needs a more user friendly form of ARCVIEW/ARCMAP to be able to use the NAIP imagery to its full potential.

Our imagery appears to have been flown at different times. Knowing when it was flown would be very useful.

Imagery was very dark. Field boundry could not be seen on a lot of fields. Our county was flown early so some of our crops were not even planted yet.

Better resolution!!!

The shadows are very hard to work with. Especially with the strips on this side of the state. Some strips are totally covered with the shadow.

The imagery was not very clear, hard to distinguish difference in crops.

Our NAIP imagery for 2005 is really poor quality. Much of it looks "smeared" and it is so dark as to pretty much look black and gray. It does not look "green" like we are used to the aerial slides looking. We worked with trying to adjust the color and adjusted the brightness and contrast on the computer monitor, but we are very disappointed in the quality of the imagery.

I sincerely hop that funds and priority can be established to obtain 1 meter resolution at minimum every other year. Without 1 meter resolution, we will be required to completed large amounts of field/ground GPS measurements and field verifications increasing our overall compliance cost.

We have been instructed that we can NOT use this imagery for CLU changes, it would be VERY helpful if we could use this imagery for CLU changes!!!

Imagery to be useful should be at the minimum be 1 meter resolution, other wise too blurry and are junk!

THE IMAGERY IS HELPFUL. IF WE GOT IT EARLIER, IT WOULD BE MORE BENEFICIAL FOR NON-AG. DETERMINATIONS. WORKLOAD WOULD BENEFIT ALSO FOR KEEPING COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES IN CURRENT FISCAL YEAR. MORE RESOLUTE IMAGERY WOULD BE GREAT SO WE COULD PERFORM BOUNDARY CHANGES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES FROM THE MOST CURRENT PHOTO IMAGERY.

2005 was a late planting season in OH. As a result, some of our early-flown NAIP was too early for good differentiation between crops. As a result, we have been in contact with APFO and have requested our flight season be adjusted. In OH, we have not yet had

opportunities to use the imagery for disaster preparedness, etc. As far as using NAIP for measurement services is concerned, we have found the 1m is immensely better for completing measurement services than is the 2m imagery (we have advised our COF not to complete measurement services off the 2m NAIP alone, but to rather use it in conjunction with GPS data, deed measurements, GIS measuring tools, etc.).

**OK –**

The quality of the 2005 NAIP was not as good as the previous year.

For compliance to be accurate, two flights are needed--one in early spring (March to April) to capture winter small grains acreage and one in mid summer (August) to capture spring and summer crop acreage.

Need flights flown earlier (mid May); Also need the imagery in the office more timely.

We are finding it very useful, it's just hard getting everybody up to speed.

I think late april or early may would be a good time to fly north central oklahoma winter wheat counties, they may even be good in March?

Needs to be received in the COF's a little earlier, but it was beneficial for compliance activities.

compliance imagery needs to be by May 15<sup>th</sup>

It needs to be simplified so that it can be more useful to employees. Better training material should be provided to the user, its much too vague in reference. Training of employees should be WHEN the software is available NOT months BEFORE it arrives in the county offices!!! It is a very complicated program to work with unless the user is accustomed to working with the imagery every day which in most county offices it just isnt possible due to lack of help to cover other programs. It COULD BE a truly useful tool if these issues could be addressed.

Having the current years imagery is very useful and vital to the field office operations. The only request is to have the imagery taken on or very near to the dates that the county requests. If we could have the imagery available in the office earlier we could save a good number of trips to the field. Determination could be made earlier along with compliance activities.

Quality was great, arrived too late for wheat spotchecks.

If feasible, having the imagery at 1 meter instead of 2 meters would help with clarity.

I have been with the agency for 27 years in December, and this is the best improvement to any program area I have seen in that time. I love it.

The NAIP process is good, our problem is not technology but rather the lack of employees needed to utilize the technology. We have the NAIP imagery but have still not begun our 2005 compliance spotchecks due to the CDP program, LAP program, NAP activity etc. and no extra help.

The quality of the image is excellent, and I know that better imagery cost money, but when we can afford it let's buy the best quality we can afford. It would be better to get close the the surface of the earth without blurring.

**OR –**

Question 3, Clarifying response; where flight lines are adjoined--the color imagery is different (causing concern that a different crop is planted in the field). 2) Question 10, Clarification--would be better to have imagery in the COF by September.

Thanks for this imagery, it was really great!

Collaborate with other entities to share information. Share our NAIP imagery in exchange for various layers (e.g. taxlot layers, waterbody and streams layers). Would like to be able to work with Oregon Extension Service on seed certification activities (save money by limiting duplication of effort required by multiple public entities).

Need to receive the imagery in a more timely way... one month earlier.

Having the imagery prior to the end of our fiscal year would be helpful in allowing our office to complete our compliance work timely

It is nice to have clear imagery to actually see the fields and crops clearly. This clarity makes it easier to identify field and property boundaries.

The new imagery is excellent to work with, except I would like to see less shadows from the the trees and steep hillsides.

We had trouble with getting the dates to work for us. This is however a very important tool to have for a lot of reasons.

We received the 2005 imagery almost on time. It needs to show up earlier in Sept or the date for having compliance done needs to be moved back so the imagery will get here for the counties to complete compliance before payments are made.

The uses listed above are the most common usages. We use the NAIP imagery on a regular basis for various program purposes, new programs, agency assistance, producer assistance, conservation compliance. It is an invaluable resource.

## PA –

Sometimes the NAIP image is shifted when compared to the ortho image.

The quality of the Naip for 2005 was poor. We had some areas where the "seams" did not match up correctly and the strips were not straight across. The contrast was not good and it was difficult to make out strips. The 2004 was a much better quality. In addition, since 2005 was a 2 meter resolution, we are not able to measure off it for CLU certification.

The NAIP for this county was a little fuzzy but what was clear was good. If we would have received the NAIP layer earlier, we could have had our compliance completed.

I was more pleased with the 2004 NAIP photography because it was much clearer than the 2005. It is almost like the 2005 is out of focus or something plus it is so much darker and even after making attempts to lighten it, it still isn't as viewable as we would hope for.

Be more timely with the 2006 NAIP.

We are unable to zoom in to the extent necessary. We have small fields and it is hard to get an accurate measurement. Photography use would be better if flown the first two weeks of July. The first part of June is too early. The clarity on fields stripcropped is hard to define on current photography.

I noticed that where flight lines are joined together, there seems to be a difference in shading - almost as if the areas were flown at different times. There will be some areas that this may be a problem with achieving an accurate measurement. Overall there was good contrast with the crops in our county which is very important for compliance use.

1. Need the NAIP sooner in the crop year. 2. A better resolution is needed to see more detail with the strip cropping system we have in Pennsylvania

Better instructions for making the NAIP images more clear and defined, ie color/tint adjusting. Also a glossary for color as it pertains to crops. Some of the changes are very subtle and therefore less discernable than slides. Making them less accurate.

It is very difficult to verify field boundaries where there is shadowing from trees or buildings. It is also hard to distinguish whether a shadowed area in the middle of a field are rocks or a wet area.

The 2004 NAIP was much better than the 2005 NAIP.

My answers would have been rated with higher satisfaction if the quality of the NAIP we received had been better. The 2 meter photography is very grainy and not particularly useful for distinguishing details such as field and strip boundaries. The quality of the

photography also varied greatly from one area of the county to another. I know it's more expensive, but the 1 meter photography is of MUCH greater value and promotes far greater accuracy for compliance and measurement service use. I find that I refer to the 04 NAIP photography (1 meter), rather than the 05 NAIP photography (2 meter), quite often when detailed viewing is required. However, I am still very happy to have current NAIP imagery available as opposed to slides and paper maps.

It should be in multi color so the crops are more distinguishable. It is very hard to tell where one crop ends and the next begins on some of the fields. Resolution should be better. We should be able to use the NAIP when we need to update the CLU; however, it currently does not match.

IF WE RECEIVED THE INFORMATION AROUND SEPTEMBER WE COULD GET THE COMPLIANCE COMPLETED QUICKER. WE COULD NOT LOCATE THE DATE OF WHEN THE NAIP WAS FLOWN, WHERE DO WE LOOK. WHEN WE ARE CERTIFIED THIS PROCESS WILL WORK GREAT. I'M NOT SURE AS YET JUST WORKING THRU BUT IF THERE IS A WAY TO CORRECT THE FIELD NUMBERS AFTER THE TRANSFER FROM THE 36 TO CLU LAYER WHILE YOU CHECK THIS WOULD SAVE ALOT OF DOUBLE WORK, BUT I'M STILL LOOKING AT THIS FROM THE UNCERTIFIED SIDE.

End User should not have to adjust settings to be able to view imagery with clarity. Our particular NAIP was extremely dark before adjusting settings.

The 2004 NAIP was much better than the 2005 NAIP.

Be more timely with the 2006 NAIP.

The NAIP for this county was a little fuzzy but what was clear was good. If we would have received the NAIP layer earlier, we could have had our compliance completed.

Improvement in the quality of the image and receiving the imagery early in the fall. Possibly taking the imagery in late spring to early summer, this may also improve the quality.

Timeliness is major drawback. We had producers waiting for months to get measurement service on late-filed crop reports for LDP's. With our limited budget for field assistants, office measurements from NAIP is much more cost effective.

I found the infrared imagery to be much more vivid and useful for crop differentiation.

The quality of the photography is poor making it very difficult to measure small strips. We are having to compare past NAIP imagery with the current year to "guess" where to best measure strips. With a majority of all crop acreage in York County being reported in strips, this makes the compliance process slow and time consuming. It also appears that

part of the imagery was acquired at one time and the rest at a later date making crop determinations difficult at best.

## **RI –**

The 2005 NAIP is not available for doing updates, or creating new farms and tracts. Having it available at an earlier time would be appreciated. Also, the imagery was dark, or red in some places, making it difficult to determine what was planted.

## **SC –**

The NAIP Imagery is a very welcome tool that we can use to assist producers and landowners in the county. We have been getting some excellent reviews from producers and sister agencies who have also made use of this imagery. However, the imagery for this particular county had multiple quality problems. One problem was that approximately 15-20% of the county was totally blocked out due to cloud cover. This was in one area. We also had a number of "popcorn" clouds appear. I understand that these areas are to re-flown. Also, in areas of the county, you could see a dramatic change in the coloration of the different flight lines.

NAIP imagery needs to be received earlier than before so that if a field visit is needed, evidence of the crop is still there. Also it would be helpful to have an option to "load acreage already performed by a field visit" when choosing acreage to use. We have a lot of late filed acreage reports loaded in the system as required checks that have to be done in the field. Those acreages are already determined by a field assistant, so we need a way to load this already determined acreage in the NAIP software options.

Needs to be received in office sooner

If possible we would like to be flown earlier than we were in 2005. May NAIP Imagery would be more useful for us and would be at a time when clouds and haze(humidity) would be reduced there by producing clearer imagery. We had problems with clouds and haze in our county's 2005 imagery. Our old photographs were taken in 1989. This imagery is so much more up to date. Thank you.

NAIP could be a successful tool for compliance spot checks if the imagery was received in a timely manner. Also, the "stitching" process by the contract was not the best.

Because our CLU layer hasn't been completed & certified it's been a little difficult. Next year once our layer has been completed, and the CRP fields correctly identified & delineated I'm sure the program will work much better.

This imagery will also be useful to producers to keep up with changing acres and delineations due to grown up fields or clearing of areas.

This is a great tool for compliance

Needs to be received in office sooner

We would like to have this layer to use in our current arcmap certification process

**SD –**

PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT ALL OF UNION COUNTY IS PHOTOGRAPHED. I STILL HAVE NOT RECEIVED A FULL COUNTY PHOTOGRAPH.

2005 Imagery was a little blurry in certain areas of the county

Color was not real good in some of the areas, some fields show up grey in color, while other fields of the same crop show up green. Overall we are satisfied with the product

The 2005 imagery for Sanborn County seems to be out of focus and not as sharp as the 2003 and 2004 imagery. Dates the imagery was flown is not easily accessed.

We find having the NAIP from past and current years very useful and it is a definite timesaver for doing compliance spotchecks and mapping new breakings.

Need Imagery in a more timely manner. More training on the use of this tool. Overall the potential of this tool is unlimited.

2005 Imagery would be more useful if flown later when the crops are more mature. It was difficult to tell the difference between a corn and a soybean field. Our County has a lot of non-cropland and CRP that is hayed. It would be easier to differentiate where the land has actually been hayed for compliance purposes if the imagery was taken in August or early September.

Other than the image being received later than we are accustomed to, we would have to say overall we are fairly satisfied with the image and how we can use it. Our 2005 image was not the clearest, however the 2004 image was very clear.

The digital imagery is much clearer and a more efficient process than the previous method of viewing slides. Also, when receiving new imagery each year it is easier to see areas of new development and changes so cropland can be revised for FSA purposes. It may be helpful to receive the current year's imagery a little earlier so compliance activity can begin sooner. For the most part, this new technology is great for the FSA office.

We find NAIP very useful in our office and it is a definite timesaver for doing compliance spotchecks!!

In 2004 Western SD had extreme drought conditions. 2004 imagery is supposed to become our base imagery. However, due to lack of rain, the imagery color is very dull and would make VERY POOR base imagery photography. We would recommend using

2005. More moisture makes a difference in the quality and usefulness of the imagery. In regards to question #2, the imagery was useful for row and small grain crops, but not all the grass hay acres were harvested before the images were captured. In 2005 we believe they were taken sometime in July.

I appreciate the clarity of the imagery. Our county measures alot of pastures and we can see the fencelines.

#5 & #7: useful, but not yet utilized. #10: month earlier flight and month earlier delivered preferred.

Would be nice to know the date that the imagery was taken for a county.

Try to get the imagery out a little sooner.

Color was not real good in some of the areas, some fields show up grey in color, while other fields of the same crop show up green. Overall we are satisfied with the product

Very happy with the 2005 imagery. Would like to have it available a little sooner.

Overall in 2005 we were very pleased with the NAIP product. If at all possible we would like to have our imagery obtained in early July to late July rather than into August and September. It would also be helpful if the NAIP imagery could be received in COF's in early September so COF's can complete compliance activities in a timely manner.

## **TX –**

The natural color imagery received for compliance was very difficult to see in our county. The colors were very dark and had to be lightened just to make the imagery usable. If some changes could be made to "brighten up" the imagery it would be very helpful. If our flights in this part of Texas should also be flown in the mid-May instead of July.

We are not CLU certified, therefore we have not used the imagery.

The imagery was flown to late to be of use in our county and since it is not in the correct meter resolution it could not be used for digitizing and CLU maintenance.

For NAIP to be "very useful" it will have to be provided to the counties on a more timely basis, and with better quality images than what were received this year..

the 2005 NAIP imagery is too dark to tell any thing for sure what is planted, tried to make it lighter, but that doesn't help, it sure is not a very clear picture to work with, needs to be lighter, I've heard some counties are almost all black. It's very difficult to do compliance with it the way it is.

need more personell in the office in order to fully utilize potential and required use

It would be much more useful if the flights were during the growing season of our primary crops and the imagery could then be TIMELY used for compliance purposes. I do believe that receiving new NAIP imagery every year is very beneficial for Non-Ag determinations and other activities.

Fight timing very important issue for compliance activites for certain FSA programs, fights in late april or early may would cover more crops for our county if only going to have one fight for the year.

Preferably, cotton images should be flown in August, wheat images in May. For us to timely complete compliance activities, we should receive the images within 60 days of flight.

imagery was not flown in timely for crops to be seen and was not flown at a height to be useful

Compliance in this county includes wheat and oats in the spring followed by corn, grain sorghum and cotton in the summer. The NAP Imagery was flow in late August and early September. Almost all crops had been harvested and fields plowed before this imagery was flown. There were a few cotton fields still unharvested at this time, but they do not look any different than the plowed field or pasture land next to them. The 2005 Nap Imagery was of almost no use for compliance activities. The imagery was dark with very limited color differential; everything was captured in shades of dark green. With a film camera, I would say it was flown in very low light conditions, such those found at sundown. The shadows in the magry do not apper lengthen or enlarged so I can only assume this is not the case with the NAP Imagery.

The county was flown too late for all crops to be seen.

We have not completed the CLU process to date.

imagery is very dark

It would help if the county office had multiple flights of NAIP imagery during the year. It is dificult to determine planted small grain acreage for NAIP imagery taken after the small grain crop is gone

Pictures need to be taken in late June in order to fully meet our needs. We need 1 meter imagery in order to updates farm boundaries, so if we could get this 1 meter imagery every 3rd year or so this would really help.

NAIP is a very useful tool for compliance purposes and reference for other program activities. The timing of the delivery was the real problem. Also, only one NAIP image was provided. In our county we do have fall seeded crops that need to be checked and

the NAIP provided only includes spring and summer seeded crops. Not being familiar with costs for the delivery of the NAIP imagery, we believe that both growing seasons should be provided.

Have not had the opportunity to use the 2005 NAIP much due to the fact we are still in the process of getting our CLU certified using the 2004 NAIP. The images were not as good for 2005 as they were for 2004.

Infrared imagery works best.

Images were too dark. Need to be flown in Late June or early July to show the most crops in Coryell County. Resolution of 2004 flight much more useful than the Resolution used in 2005. 2005 imagery was hard to zoom in close enough to get the detail often need.

Our NAIP imagery was very poor as it seems to have been flown too early in the growing season. At the time it was flown, crops had just been planted for about a month, not enough time to be able to view them on the imagery. Therefore, our compliance activities were very little better than a guess in most cases.

Our farmers begin planting their spring crops in late January and February. In order for the NAIP imagery to be used for compliance, the imagery would need to be taken in May. By June they are already harvesting their crops. Our producers also plant fall crops. They are planted from August to October.

We feel that the NAIP imagery is very beneficial. Our County has two distinct crops - fall seeded and spring seeded. We feel that if NAIP Imagery is done only one time per year it will lose some of its value for spot check purposes.

**THE IMAGERY FOR THIS COUNTY IS VERY DARK AND WHEN PRINTING A MAP THE RESOLUTION IS BLURRY**

Proper training of the use of the compliance tool would have greatly improved my ability to utilize NAIP imagery. Most of my work with the imagery has come as a result of another person leaving the agency during the later stages of setting this up in our county office. I have had very little training--have primarily self-taught myself; therefore I am sure there are many things I could utilize the imagery for that would be beneficial to the agency if I had the time to devote to more investigation..

For compliance it would help to have wheat flown in Spring and Corn, cotton, sorghum flown in summer.

Need a lot of formal training to be effective in using imagery

needs to be done in our county in May or June

A great step forward in our imagery field.

It needs to be more clear, more definition.

The purpose of the NAIP Imagery is a very good one. The imagery that we received for 2005 was too late to benefit the county office a great deal. Future NAIP Imagery flown and received timely will be very beneficial to county offices for several programs.

Preferably, cotton images should be flown in August, wheat images in May. For us to timely complete compliance activities, we should receive the images within 60 days of flight

Would like to use imagery to keep up with CRP managed/emergency grazing and failed acres for a crop year. Would be helpful determining heavy weather areas. Also will we be getting the 1meter imagery again for use as base photography? Our county has had lots of pivots put up since the 1meter imagery in 2004. We would also like to designate drip irrigation fields.

**WE NEED IT SOONER**

2005 NAIP imagery was not clear and darkness/quality of colors prevented identification of crops. Imagery was not received timely.

NAIP is a very useful tool for compliance purposes and reference for other program activities. The timing of the delivery was the real problem. Also, only one NAIP image was provided. In our county we do have fall seeded crops that need to be checked and the NAIP provided only includes spring and summer seeded crops. Not being familiar with costs for the delivery of the NAIP imagery, we believe that both growing seasons should be provided.

crop certification is year round in our area, one flight only identifies what is growing at that time and does not take in multiple planting of the same field

NAIP Imagery is flown too late to provide much use for fall seeded/winter wheat, winter rye compliance activities. We have significant acreages (>50% of all cropland) of fall seeded crops grown for grazing and grain. Most participate in DCP and several acres in NAP. NAIP Imagery would be useful historically when there are Disaster Programs, but many of those planted acres can not be seen on the imagery because of the lateness of flights. We are in an area where two flights are essential in order to get a snapshot of the annually planted crops on all acres.

Receiving the imagery timely would be helpful instead of months late.

The NAIP imagery could be very useful in the county office if it were received more timely. The imagery worked great for spot checks and in a county that is changing daily, it works well for CLU maintenance.

Our imagery is too dark to tell if a crop was planted or the field was just plowed.

Need NAIP to be flown earlier (between June 1 - July 1) in our county. This will allow us to use this for updating changes, measurement services and compliance spot checks. Also, we need to receive the imagery in a more timely manner.

Earlier flight would be better for our county for the wheat. The 2005 flight was flown after wheat harvest and only plowed fields were visible.

more timely flights and delivery of the NAIP

This could be very useful depending on the timeframe, proper training at the county level, and knowledge of useage

We are not CLU certified, therefore we have not used the imagery.

I would have been more satisfied with NAIP if it was flown when the crops were in the fields and delivered timely. Ideally the NAIP should have been flown in mid May. At that time you would be able to see the wheat and oats that would be ready to harvest and you would see the corn and grain sorghum that would have been growing at least 90 days. The only crop that would be a little hard to see would be cotton because it is not planted until April. However, you would probably see enough of it to make a determination.

I am sure NAIP is a great asset to work with once you are able to make use of it.

Imagery is very dark and difficult to utilize.

Much training needed, time and personnel

Do the imagery earlier in order to see the crops in the fields. Also needs to be clearer.

To be useful in this county, we need the imagery to be flown June 1 - June 30. Our imagery was flown in the fall when all spring crops were already harvested and the fall seeded crops were not up yet. The 2005 imagery was also very dark and could not be lightened up enough to do any good.

Please provide the NAIP Imagery earlier so it can be utilized to identify wheat, oats, & barley.

One meter scale is required and was not delivered in 2005. Time of delivery must improve to be very helpful to county offices.

NAIP color is not as clear as I would have hoped.

Do the imagery earlier in order to see the crops in the fields. Also needs to be clearer.

On CRP fields it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between naturally occurring trees and planted ones. Also the NAIP Imagery could have been delivered on a more timely basis.

crop certification is year round in our area, one flight only identifies what is growing at that time and does not take in multiple planting of the same field

It would be much more useful if the flights were during the growing season of our primary crops and the imagery could then be TIMELY used for compliance purposes. I do believe that receiving new NAIP imagery every year is very beneficial for Non-Ag determinations and other activities.

If it would have been delivered for use on wheat it would have been much better. It still worked well for compliance on summer crops.

Have not been able to open the NAIP as of yet. I am sure once we get to where we can work and see the crops NAIP will be a great asset to get work done.

Our County is predominately Native Range.

the color and contrast is poor and/or needs refinement. If we were flown in July, there was a long lag time until imagery was received in January. Other than that, it seems to be a useful project. It has potential.

The NAIP imagery was too dark. We lightened the imagery to make it readable. The color had no contrast.. However, we could make out the new houses, buildings and permanent structures for use in our CLU certification process.

Obtain earlier and send to county sooner

Needed to receive earlier and better clarity/color; too dark without modifications

Received the imagery too late in year to be of much assistance. Couldn't tell a lot about what was on the ground in most cases.

To be useful for measurement service, it must be received earlier in the year. Timely for each crop harvest.

The quality of the image was not nearly good enough. There is no contrast between crops and land uses. They are all about the same shade or color, and too dark. When you compare the 05 naip imagery to the color slides we have been using to perform compliance work, it is pretty poor. We really could not use it with any degree of certainty that we had measured a crop correctly, and certainly could not be sure we had identified a crop correctly. With the old color slides we could do both with a great degree of certainty.

I have just received NAIP and have not spent much time with it, so I do not know how useful it will be. I would like to have received it earlier.

To be useful for measurement service, it must be received earlier in the year. Timely for each crop harvest.

The best time to fly this county would be in May or June

Excellent tool. Keep enhancing it. Thanks.

I would just like to see it received in the county office sooner for measurement service and compliance purposes.

NAIP MUST be flown more timely for it to be useful with county office compliance or measurement service activities.

Receiving the imagery earlier would have been better for defoliated cotton. The imagery was useful for validation only on certification. For spring seeded crops, an earlier flight would have been more useful. Very satisfied with imagery but not satisfied with date flown. Better late than never.....

It's all a good process, timing is the key issue. The CLU and NAIP imagery takes a full time employee, at this time we are not fortunate enough to have someone obligated full time to this project. If we were staffed correctly this would be a great resource.

The imagery is very useful, however the timing of the flight has been too late to accurately show the crops for the current year and we receive the imagery so late that we are constantly behind schedule on compliance. If the flight was done earlier in the growing season, then this imagery could not only be good and helpful, it would be great and essential.

We need to receive the imagery in a timely manner in order to accurately complete compliance activities. Our normal planting season months are February through May. Our normal harvest season months are June through September.

We services 4 Real Counties as of yet I've only been able to open 1. I am sure that NAIP is a great asset to work with once we are able to use it also if its flown while the crops are there

Receved the imagery too late in year to be of much assistance. Couldn't tell a lot about what was on the ground in most cases.

A great step forward in our imagery field.

Imagery needs to be taken during are primary crop growth witch is May - July to be more accurate with compliance. Also must have imagery back by first of the year because this county is in a place were there is constant change in farmland.

Hopefully the imagery will reach us in a more timely manner. Our wheat, corn, and grain sorghum crops were harvested when the imagery was flown.

In our opinion, 2005 NAIP Imagery was taken much too early. Crop canopy was not well developed at the time imagery was taken. Even with this early date, county did not have access to imagery until late in the the season. Compliance activity has still not been completed due to receiving imagery late. Although not part of this process, compliance software was not received until late causing additional delays. The use of NAIP imagery can be very beneficial to the county office. It can be one of the best tools we have ever had. The 2004 1 meter imagery proves this. It was excellent.

The NAIP imagery was good with the exception of one area with cloud cover that could not be used at all. It needed to be received early to be able to complete spot checks in a time manner. Other than those two problems it has been a great tool.

The NAIP imagery was too dark. We lightened the imagery to make it readable. The color had no contrast.. However, we could make out the new houses, buildings and permanent structures for use in our CLU certification process.

the 2005 NAIP imagery is too dark to tell any thing for sure what is planted, tried to make it lighter, but that doesn't help, it sure is not a very clear picture to work with, needs to be lighter, I've heard some counties are almost all black. It's very difficult to do compliance with it the way it is.

We would have liked for our county to have been flown sooner; where the crops were still in the ground. The best time to fly our county would be May or June

A great step forward in our imagery field.

The imagery was very good, however it was delivered too late for us to use on both fall/winter and summer measurement services. The final date to certify summer crops if July 15 and we did not receive the imagery until late November. If a producer requestes measurement service, he would appreciate the service being preformed at least by harvest not after the crop is harvested and sold!

NAIP imagery was very useful for spring seeded crops in the area, however we really needed the imagery to be in the spring to show more accurate lines for the fall seeded crop of wheat.

It was too late to help with certification and measurement service

crop certification is year round in our area, one flight only identifies what is growing at that time and does not take in multiple planting of the same field

The imagery is extremely dark.

The imagery is not in as true color as I was expected to believe. It reflects varying shades of camouflage green, even on fallow fields.

I am sure NAIP is a great asset to work with once you are able to use it.

Received the imagery too late in year to be of much assistance. Couldn't tell a lot about what was on the ground in most cases.

I would just like to see it received in the county office sooner for measurement service and compliance purposes.

imagery very dark

The imagery is ok, it could have been a little lighter. We really need the NAIP twice a year to get our measurements done before the crops are harvested. One problem seems to be in the compliance tools and the tables. In our County we have so many pivots that by the time you draw off all the corners and other fields and then go back and actually measure them, it is very time consuming. We need a circle maker that will help us make the corners a little easier. We haven't saved any time with the NAIP. I think the old way with slides was quicker.

THE IMAGERY FOR THIS COUNTY IS VERY DARK AND WHEN PRINTING A MAP THE RESOLUTION IS BLURRY

need to receive earlier; too dark to view without modification

**VA –**

THE 2005 NAIP IMAGERY WAS CONSIDERABLE DARK FOR SOME OF OUR COUNTIES.

We need the imagery by the end of September not the end of November. Also some flight lines were flown before some crops were planted in maybe May and some flight lines were flown in July or August.

Timely receipt of NAIP imagery is vital. Handbook provisions requiring ground measurements to begin if imagery has not been received by a set date may be an area the National Office may want to revisit. Long lapses of time between flight dates causing individual fields to be covered by split imagery has resulted in difficulty determining crop lines.

The imagery is very useful in updating clu and using for reference. It is hard to use it for compliance as it is very late. We do prefer NAIP imagery to slides. It would just be more useful if it was more timely.

Delivery of imagery sooner would be my only suggestion. At the very least, before corn harvest begins in late August or early September.

Try to get it to us in time to do compliance determination timely & speed up process.

We need future imagery to be received in July or early August.

THE 2005 NAIP IMAGERY WAS CONSIDERABLE DARK FOR SOME OF OUR COUNTIES.

NAIP imagery needs to be received in the County Office by August 1st in order to be completed timely.

Imagery needs to be flown mid July to Early August in our area, and for that matter, the entire state. Imagery needs to be delivered as quickly after flight as possible.

NAIP should be delivered by August 15 at the latest to be used for compliance purposes. The images we received this year were very dark and we could not adjust our computer display's brightness and contrast enough to compensate for this.

The photography is quite useful and we utilize it often. We receive it too late in the year for it to be of optimum use. 2005 was too dark. Higher resolution would be nice. Finally, it would be great if it could be of sufficient quality to use as the orthoimagery for CLU maintenance and map production.

I am excited about what we can do with the imagery. My concern right now is that there is adequate training and top notch software to run the programs.

If the imagery was clearer it would help in finding the boundaries.

Imagery photo quality was sometimes too dark or cloudy to utilize for compliance purposes, thus, ground measurement was implemented in those cases.

**WA –**

The timely deliverance of the product is necessary.

Delivery of Imagery was to slow.

## WI –

The 1 meter resolution is a far cry from the 2 meter resolution. So much more can be seen that is beneficial to our work that I would make the suggestion that 1 meter resolution be made permanent requirement for our use.

It would be more helpful if the imagery was flown a few weeks later.

Our 2005 NAIP has been an important asset to our operations. The clarity is great and NAIP is used extensively in our office. The only drawback was the timing. We should be flown the 2nd or 3rd week of June for better crop compliance issues.

Fly in mid July.

The old black and white photos that we use to use and the NAIP imagery is like the difference of night and day.

The 2005 NAIP Imagery was flown too early in our area. It is very difficult to identify the different crops this year. It was very helpful that 2005 NAIP imagery was rectified this year. Thank you.

THIS WAS OUR FIRST YEAR WITH NAIP IMAGERY. GIVEN TIME AND ADDITIONAL TRAINING WE FEEL THE POSSIBILITIES ARE UNLIMITED.

The NAIP imagery is of very good quality. Ideally the NAIP imagery should be delivered in August, so compliance work can be completed prior to the start of LDP's . NAIP was flown too early for our county, as we are in the Northern part of the state.

NAIP is an outstanding tool that has made our jobs at the county level much easier.

This year's photography is very difficult to use for crop identification. It appears that we were flown anywhere from the beginning of June to mid to late July. Corn looks one way in one section and is at an entirely different stage in another photo. No consistancy in appearance - which means I can't decide if their crop reports are done correctly for compliance.

This is our first year with NAIP imagery. In 2004 we had unrectified imagery so we really appreciate the NAIP imagery.

Need to have the photos taken late enough in crop development so that crops can be identified accurately. This has been a problem the last two years, with many fields showing up brown, and the crop cannot be identified. I have suggested to our State Office GIS Specialist that either the contract have a later start date, or preferably in Wisconsin there should be three seperate zones, the southern third, the middle third, and the northern third, each with the photos taken during different periods. When aerial photo flights are flown in north-south flight lines the entire length of the state this causes

severe problems, since normally crop development is about one month later in the northern third of the state than the southern row or two of counties next to the Illinois border. This REALLY needs to be addressed and changed! Also, it would be good to build some additional flexibility into the contracts so that if there is a wet spring (like we had in 2003) and much of the planting is delayed until late June and even early July as it was that year, that the flights could be delayed in certain parts of a state. Thanks for the opportunity for feedback!

Fly dates in 2005 were too early for us to determine between crops. Established hay and winter wheat were easy to see.

The 1 meter resolution is a far cry from the 2 meter resolution. So much more can be seen that is beneficial to our work that I would make the suggestion that 1 meter resolution be made permanent requirement for our use.

NAIP was received quite late - LDP's had already been paid on incorrect acreage. Was also flown quite late - we found several fields that were already worked up so there was no way to know what they had been planted to in 2005.

Having NAIP imagery is one of the best tools I have worked with. I hope it continues for years to come because I feel it can only be more beneficial for compliance and historical purposes.

'05 NAIP has been a critical update for our CLU maintenance efforts because most of our base imagery was from 1992-1995. The quality, timeliness, and accuracy was very good, but the flight started too early for making crop determinations in WI (June 1). It does not make sense that Illinois to the south started their flight on July 1st and our starting flight date was set as June 1st. Although I requested a later flight date, APFO and the national office did not change it.